

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

TIMAERO IRELAND LIMITED,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE BOEING COMPANY,

Defendant.

No. 2:21-00488-RSM

**STIPULATED MOTION AND
ORDER TO AMEND
DISCOVERY SCHEDULE**

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Civil Rules 7(d)(1), 7(j), 10(g), and 16(b)(6), Plaintiff Timaero Ireland Limited (“Timaero”) and Defendant The Boeing Company (“Boeing”) (collectively, the “Parties”) jointly move the Court for an order revising the discovery schedule set forth in the Court’s April 8, 2024 Order Setting Trial Date and Related Dates (Dkt. No. 140), without adjusting the trial date.

The parties are close to completing document discovery and have started to notice depositions (although none have been confirmed at this time). The current expert disclosure deadline is July 9. The Parties propose a modest extension to the same.

1 This extension will not impact any Court filing deadlines or the trial date.

2 The Parties are timely making this request, well in advance of two weeks before the current
3 September 8, 2025 discovery deadline to ensure the Court has sufficient time to decide the motion.
4 For these reasons and those detailed below, good cause exists to revise the case schedule.

5 II. LEGAL STANDARD

6 “The decision to modify a scheduling order is within the broad discretion of the district
7 court.” *James v. Nationwide Affinity Ins. Co. of Am.*, No. C22-772-RSM, 2023 WL 5020403, at
8 *1 (W.D. Wash. July 31, 2023) (Martinez, J.) (citation omitted). The Court may extend the case
9 schedule where good cause exists. Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4); LCR 16(b)(6). “Rule 16(b)’s ‘good
10 cause’ standard primarily considers the diligence of the party seeking the amendment.” *Johnson*
11 *v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). “The district court may modify
12 the pretrial schedule ‘if it cannot reasonably be met despite the diligence of the party seeking the
13 extension.’” *Id.* (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 16 advisory committee’s notes (1983 amendment)). Local
14 Civil Rule 7(j) establishes that “[a] motion for relief from a deadline should, whenever possible,
15 be filed sufficiently in advance of the deadline to allow the court to rule on the motion prior to the
16 deadline.”

17 III. ARGUMENT

18 Good cause exists to modestly extend the discovery deadlines. Since the Court’s April 8,
19 2024 Order Setting Trial Date and Related Dates (Dkt. No. 140), the parties have diligently en-
20 gaged in the discovery process and made good faith efforts to complete their productions.

21 The Parties jointly ask to extend the case schedule and neither alleges
22 that any prejudice would arise from the extension.

23 Allowing the Parties to complete fact and expert discovery by extending the discovery
24 deadlines also will contribute to the efficient and just resolution of this case, by ensuring that de-
25 cision-making on any Daubert motions, dispositive motions, and—if necessary—at trial is based

1 on a full and complete record. *See St. George v. Sequim Sch. Dist.*, No. 18-CV-05372-RJB, 2018
2 WL 6518118, at *1 (W.D. Wash. Dec. 11, 2018) (“An extension of the remaining court deadlines
3 is appropriate to allow the parties to complete discovery and engage in further discussions related
4 to resolution.”).

5 Furthermore, the Parties are filing this motion well in advance of the discovery deadline,
6 and it will not impact the Court’s filing deadline for filing dispositive motions (October 7, 2025),
7 motions in limine (December 8, 2025), or trial briefs (December 31, 2025).

8 The Parties’ timely motion, their efforts to meet the Court’s deadlines, and the lack of
9 prejudice on any party or the Court all point to good cause. Accordingly, the Parties respectfully
10 request that the Court enter an order modifying the schedule as follows:

	Current Dates	New Dates
12 Disclosure of expert testimony under 13 FRCP 26(a)(2)	July 9, 2025	July 29, 2025
14 Deadline for filing motions related to discovery. 15 Any such motions shall be noted for considera- 16 tion pursuant to LCR 7(d)(3)	August 8, 2025	August 22, 2025
17 Discovery completed by	September 8, 2025	September 22, 2025

IT IS SO STIPULATED by and between the Parties.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 25th day
of June, 2025.

I certify that this motion/memorandum con-
tains 74 words, in compliance with the Local
Civil Rules.

By: s/Ulrike B. Connelly

Kathleen M. O'Sullivan, WSBA No. 27850
Harry H. Schneider, Jr., WSBA No. 9404
Ulrike B. Connelly, WSBA No. 42478
Sarah L. Schirack, WSBA No. 59669
Marten N. King, WSBA No. 57106

Perkins Coie LLP

1301 Second Avenue, Suite 4200
Seattle, Washington 98101-3099

Telephone: +1.206.359.8000

Facsimile: +1.206.359.9000

KO'Sullivan@perkinscoie.com

HSchneider@perkinscoie.com

UConnelly@perkinscoie.com

MKing@perkinscoie.com

Attorneys for Defendant The Boeing Company

By: s/Alan Harrison

Alan Harrison, *pro hac vice*

600 Summer Street

Stamford, Connecticut 06901

Telephone: +1.203.703.0800

Facsimile: +1.203.703.0801

aharrison@whipgroup.com

Gregory J. Hollon, WSBA No. 26311 Timothy

B. Fitzgerald, WSBA No. 45103 600

University Street, Suite 2700

Seattle, Washington 98101

Phone: +1.206.467.1816

Fax: +1.206.624.5128

ghollon@mcnaul.com

tfitzgerald@mcnaul.com


Attorneys for Plaintiff

ORDER

PURSUANT TO THE FOREGOING STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED. The deadline for the Parties shall be extended as follows:

	Current Dates	New Dates
Disclosure of expert testimony under FRCP 26(a)(2)	July 9, 2025	July 29, 2025
Deadline for filing motions related to discovery. Any such motions shall be noted for consideration pursuant to LCR 7(d)(3)	August 8, 2025	August 22, 2025
Discovery completed by	September 8, 2025	September 22, 2025

DATED this 30th day of June, 2025.



RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE